

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A469

It is also a demonstration of the multiplier effect which brings changes in hospital organization, administration, and teaching techniques, resulting eventually in a better health and economy for the nations visited by the *Hope*.

A Tribute to Fred Conn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the January 30, 1963, edition of the *Denison* (Tex.) Herald, is a tribute to Fred Conn, publisher of the *Denison Herald* for the past 19 years, who resigned effective last month to assume the position of publisher of the *San Angelo Standard Times*.

Fred Conn served the north Texas area with over 24 years of service with the *Herald*, and his past performances and new position reflect most adequately his record of service to *Denison* and the people of north Texas.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the *Herald's* tribute to Fred Conn:

HERALD'S FAREWELL TO PUBLISHER

The *Denison Herald* personnel share with the community as a whole, perhaps in a more personal and direct way, the loss of a leader and friend that came yesterday when Fred Conn said his farewells and left for a new home and new field at *San Angelo*.

Conn had been linked with the *Herald* management for 24 years, as publisher for the last 19 years. His record of achievement here is underscored in many ways, but in no instance more positively than by his stepping up to the considerably larger challenge as publisher of the *San Angelo Standard-Times*.

Much has been said during the last few days in the way of farewells to Mr. Conn and his family about his outstanding service to *Denison* and this area. And much more could have been said, as we who were closely associated with him here on the *Herald* realize.

We were in a position to fully appreciate his dogged determination in championing what he believed was best for *Denison*. We saw at close range the earnestness of conviction and purpose that motivated his efforts in behalf of the community.

We also saw that same dedication to clearly defined goals in his administration of *Herald* affairs, large and small. The ultimate decision inevitably lay in what was the best for the newspaper and the public it served. Mr. Conn built into the *Herald* a new depth of influence and value as a community asset, which is the final justification for any newspaper's existence.

We on the *Herald* are proud to accept this responsibility that now passes to us—although we, quite frankly, are sobered by the realization of its weight. We pledge our adherence to the same policy of serving *Denison* and this area as industriously, as faithfully, and as unselfishly as possible.

Leaving *Denison* was no easy decision for Mr. Conn—not after he had so intimately identified himself with this community's welfare through the years. He earnestly believed that "the citizenship and leadership here is of the highest type" and that this

area is destined for as great a future as its unity and cooperation will accommodate.

Mr. Conn took to *San Angelo* with him the earnest wishes of the entire *Herald* organization—as well as the community as a whole—for newer and greater successes. And we underscore that wish with the assurance that all of us on the *Herald* will strive to carry on in a worthy manner.

Lutherans Support U.S. Policy on Cuban Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the resettlement of Cuban refugees is a problem to which many of our church denominations have given much attention and assistance. Among these are the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America, working through the National Lutheran Council, and the Board of World Relief of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, which is my own denomination.

I recently received a statement on Cuban refugees from the office of Dr. Paul C. Emple, executive director of the National Lutheran Council, dealing with the Cuban refugee resettlement problem. The contents of that news release are of sufficient importance that they should be noted by those who have a concern for its solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the National Lutheran Council on its support for Government efforts to speed resettlement of Cuban refugees be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LUTHERAN LEADER BACKS U.S. POLICY ON CUBAN REFUGEES

NEW YORK.—Efforts by the U.S. Government to hasten the resettlement of Cuban refugees received strong support here from a Lutheran Church leader.

Dr. Paul C. Emple, executive director of the National Lutheran Council, said the council welcomes the Government's recent policy statement on the \$72-million-a-year relief program instituted by the late President Kennedy in 1961.

It was announced that Federal aid to employable Cuban refugees in Miami will be cut off next March 31 if they refuse to relocate in cities where work is available.

By that date, all 100,000 registered at the U.S. Cuban Refugee Center in Miami will be interviewed and efforts made to place them. Some 70,000 refugees have already been resettled and it is estimated that half those remaining should be relocated.

"The choice of a Cuban refugee to resettlement to an opportunity offered to him elsewhere, or to remain in Miami without public assistance, is a free choice," declared John F. Thomas, director of the U.S. Cuban Refugee program under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"It is a choice which must be made by each individual and family," he added. "It is exactly the same choice which faces an American citizen who becomes unemployed here."

Dr. Emple said the National Lutheran Council is cooperating with the Lutheran Immigration Service in a 2-year, \$160,000 program in 1963 and 1964 to help Cuban refugees in their efforts to resettle and/or integrate "in a wholesome fashion" during their stay in this country.

Participating in the special project are the two member bodies of the NLC, the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America, and the Board of World Relief of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. The board's director, the Reverend Werner Kuntz of Detroit, endorsed the views expressed here by Dr. Emple.

Announcement of the Government's aims was made in Miami on December 12 by Mr. Thomas in a statement which, he said, "indicates no change in program policy, but rather a restatement of policy, in view of the present stage of the refugee program."

"The goal of the Federal Government will be to continue to be as helpful as possible to every refugee to become a self-supporting and contributing member of our society during his exile," Mr. Thomas said.

"Together with the religious and nonsectarian resettlement agencies we shall continue to place before each refugee, as his turn for interview comes up, the opportunities for resettlement in the area outside Miami. If a person refuses and has no valid reason for refusal he will be denied eligibility for economic aid in Miami."

Mr. Thomas added that "this policy is merely designed to encourage the refugee who is caught in a vicious web of uncertainty, dependency, and propaganda to face the realities of life."

Dr. Emple noted that Mr. Thomas explicitly stated that there are no punitive motives in this policy, the setting of a target date for the completion of interviewing does not mean the closing of the Cuban Refugee Center by March 31, and it applies only to those who are not prevented from accepting a resettlement opportunity by reasons of bad health or physical handicaps.

"We believe," the Lutheran churchman said, "that with appropriate flexibility in dealing with exceptional cases and with a sympathetic approach to the problem, these safeguards should be ample protection for those Cuban refugees who have valid reasons for remaining in the Miami area."

Dr. Emple said he recognized the close relation "between the goal of helping a refugee to become self-supporting and a contributing member of society and the necessity of refusing to give him public aid if, without a valid reason, he refuses to accept an opportunity for self-support outside the Miami area."

He also said "we can understand and sympathize with the natural desire" of the Cuban refugees to stay in an area where their language is commonly spoken, where the climate is similar to that of their homeland, and where, by telephone and radio, they can keep in touch with developments in their native country.

"At the same time, our experience in other refugee programs leads us to the conviction that the perpetuation of economic relief to persons who are able to support themselves and refuse to do so inevitably leads to moral and social deterioration," Dr. Emple stressed.

"The experience of over 70,000 Cuban refugees who have been resettled successfully in other parts of the United States and who love their country with undiminished devotion and continue to speak on her behalf wherever they may be, provides ample evidence to support the judgment that the policy stated by the director of the Cuban Refugee program is both reasonable and constructive."

Dr. Emple asserted that "in view of the political factors which surround the Cuban refugee situation," the statement issued by Mr. Thomas "required a great deal of courage on his part" when "the easier thing

A470

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 3

would have been to let the matter drift to avoid the recriminations which surely will be heaped upon him."

The Lutheran leader voiced the belief that Mr. Thomas "has demonstrated the competence and responsible leadership which we expect of our Government officials" and commended him for "facing up to his responsibilities with such intelligence and integrity."

"His statement gives us both incentive and encouragement to continue to assist the Cuban refugees to the extent of our available resources in the period during which the program will continue," Dr. Emple concluded.

Israel Shows the Way to Regional Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 3, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the heads of the 13 Arab States met in Cairo and when they concluded their 3-day summit meeting they released a communique replete with invective against the State of Israel.

What was this so-called dangerous and ominous act of aggression on the part of Israel which brought together such enemies as Yemen's President Salal and Saudi Arabia's King Saud, Algeria's Ben Bella and King Hassan of Morocco, Jordan's King Hussein, and Gamal Abdel Nasser? It was the imminent completion of Israel's Jordan River development project. Because of their irrational hatred of Israel, the Arabs have adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward Israel's water program. They fight it and inveigh against it, even though it would do them no harm. Israel will gain much-needed water for irrigation. The Arabs will lose not one drop because of it.

Actually, the Middle East does not lack for water. It has, in some areas, plenty of rainfall. Four of its rivers—the Euphrates, the Orontes, the Litani and the Jordan—hold more than 30 billion cubic meters of water. But most of it is wasted. The water runs, unused, into the sea. In the rainy season, torrents of water flood northern Israel, but, uncontrolled, they drain wastefully away.

Many American statesmen and engineers have long been interested in putting these waters to work. In 1918, when the mandates for Palestine and Syria were being negotiated, President Woodrow Wilson proposed that Palestine's northern border include the Litani River. His recommendation was not accepted and so today most of the Litani River water, allocated to Lebanon, is wasted.

But Britain's Prime Minister Lloyd George insisted that the Jordan River and its sources be within Palestine's borders. "The waters of Palestine," he said, "are essential to its existence. Without these waters Palestine would be

a wilderness. On the other hand, these waters are of no use to anyone holding Syria." And so the international frontier of Palestine was fixed east of the Jordan and Lake Tiberias.

Israel is already using 80 percent of its total water supply to irrigate cultivated land. Almost all of the remaining 20 percent comes from the Jordan. But in the southern Negev, which is arable, there is no water. To irrigate this land, Israel must move its northern water to the south—by canals, tunnels, and pipes. This is the system that will be put into operation this spring. It is completely within the guidelines of what is known as the Johnston plan.

This is not a new scheme. The eminent American conservationist, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, proposed a Jordan Valley Authority—something like our own TVA—in 1939, to use the Jordan for both power and irrigation. But the Arabs went to war against Israel and the plan had to be dropped. In 1953, however, Israel began work on its own and started to build a canal which would lead to a hydroelectric plant and then move the water through a pipeline to the south. The work was begun at Bnot Yaakov, which is in a "demilitarized zone" and Syria protested the canal's construction with gunfire. The issue went to the U.N. Security Council. The work was stopped while the United Nations studied ways of mollifying the Syrians.

In 1953, President Eisenhower sent Ambassador Eric Johnston to the Middle East. After 2 years of negotiations, Mr. Johnston was able to secure the agreement of Israel and Arab technicians to a unified plan. Syria and Lebanon, which need very little of the Jordan River waters, were allotted the small percentage they requested. Jordan was given all the water it needed to irrigate the irrigable land on its side of the river—about 120,000 acres. Israel was allotted what was left.

That meant that 61 percent of the water would go to the three Arab countries and Israel would get about 39 percent. In addition, Israel was to bunk about 300 million cubic meters of water to Jordan's account in the Sea of Galilee, releasing it in the dry season to be conveyed to Jordanian lands east of the Jordan River.

Despite the fact that the figures had been suggested by the Arab technicians and Israel accepted them only because of her eagerness for an overall agreement, Arab politicians refused to ratify the plan. They would enter into no agreement that would benefit Israel in any way.

But even without an overall agreement, both Israel and Jordan have gone ahead with separate plans consistent with Mr. Johnston's original proposal.

Jordan has nearly completed its East Ghazal Canal, utilizing most of the Yarmouk waters. This \$25 million project—the United States is contributing \$19 million of it—will irrigate 30,000 acres and Jordan will increase its acreage by 25 percent, resettling 3,000 families.

The route Israel is taking to draw water from Lake Tiberias to irrigate the

Negev avoids the problems which would arise if the project went through the demilitarized zone. But the problems presented by the new plan are costly. The original plan would have drawn water which was virtually salt free. But, because of the salt springs on the floor of Lake Tiberias, the water that Israel will now draw from the Jordan has high salinity and must be mixed with ground water from the coastal plain to make it suitable for irrigation.

One thing should be kept clearly in mind. Israel will not draw any more water from the Jordan than was allotted to her under the Johnston plan. In fact, she will draw less. Israel will use only 1 percent of the 30 billion cubic meters of water available to the Arab States. But this fact does not seem to impress the Arabs. They now threaten to divert the headwaters of the Jordan, cutting the flow of the river to a trickle. Even though such a diversion would be one of the most expensive and surely the most impracticable engineering feat in history, they came to the astounding conclusion at the Cairo meeting that this would be their answer to Israel's life-giving program. And the worst of this bizarre scheme is that the diverted waters would, after all, again flow wastefully into the sea.

Recently, Deputy Under Secretary of State U. Alexis Johnson said that the United States will come speedily to the aid of "any intended victim of any would-be aggressor" in the Middle East. Mr. Johnson also said that one of our foremost goals in the region is "an accommodation between Israel and its Arab neighbors." I am very glad to hear this and I hope our Government loses no time in trying to implement this goal. I am convinced that if we can get the Arabs to sit with Israel and negotiate with her, the whole region would benefit to an extraordinary degree. With peace, there could be not only regional water plans—but regional cooperation in technology, medicine, and education—a real meeting of people's minds and an end to the arms race. There is a great potential in the Middle East that is now being wasted—not only water.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution, House Resolution 447, proposes that the U.S. House of Representatives urge that the U.S. delegation to the U.N. support a resolution for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States as "an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation and the settlement of all outstanding disputes between them."

I urge our Government to work for regional understanding—an end to boycotts, blockades, threats, and the building up of aggressive arsenals. It would seem that the Arab leaders decided at Cairo that the time to attack Israel is not now but I think it would be premature for us to breathe a collective sigh of relief. If, when they feel strong enough, they make any move toward action against Israel, our Government must make it clear that we will stand by our commitment to keep the peace in the Middle East.